



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,409	12/20/2000	Kent K. Leung	CISCP173/2845	3339
22434	7590	08/19/2004	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP P.O. BOX 778 BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778				MARTINEZ, DAVID E
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2182				

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/746,409	LEUNG, KENT K.
Examiner	Art Unit	
David E Martinez	2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Telephone election 8/6/04.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-71 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-19 and 36-38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 20,24,34,35,39,43,53-55,59 and 69-71 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 21-23,25-33,40-42,44-52,56-58 and 60-68 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/02 9/02 9/03 10/03 1/04 DTM

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

The Election Response sent by the Applicant on 6/29/04 elected Group 1 (Species 1) on page 1, and then in the Remarks section, page 2, elected Species 2. A telephone communication on 8/6/04 to Elise Heilbrunn was made to clarify the election of a particular Species either Species 1 or Species 2. Applicant's election without traverse of Species 2, claims 20-35, 39-54, and 55-71 was made and is now acknowledged.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because on figures 1, 2, 3A and 3B, the handwritten label of elements are hard to read. Computer designed drawings are recommended over hand-drawn drawings. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 20, 24, 39, 43, 55, 59, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,510,153 to Inoue et al. (Inoue).

1. With regards to claims 20, 39, 55, and 71, Inoue teaches a mobile router supporting Mobile IP and being capable of requesting one or more networks during registration with a Home Agent [abstract], the mobile router comprising:

a processor ['the mobile computer management device' must have a processor to process the data packets/datagrams/messages and relay them over a network to other nodes, column 3 lines 5-21];

a memory [column 3 lines 5-13], at least one of the processor and the memory being adapted for:

composing a registration request packet, the registration request packet including a network allocation extension indicating one or more networks being requested by the mobile router from a Home Agent [column 3 lines 13-17];

sending the registration request packet to the Home Agent [column 3 lines 13-17]; and

receiving a registration reply packet from the Home Agent, the registration reply including a network allocation extension identifying one or more networks allocated to the mobile router by the Home Agent [column 3 lines 17-21, column 3 lines 39-44].

2. With regards to claim 24, 43, and 59, Inoue teaches the mobile router as recited in claim 20, wherein at least one of the processor and the memory are further adapted for:

selecting from the one or more networks allocated to the mobile router by the Home Agent an IP address; and

configuring an interface of the mobile router with the IP address such that a network coupled to the interface is identified by the IP address [column 3 lines 5-21, lines 39-44].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 34, 35, 53, 54, 69, and 70, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,510,153 to Inoue et al. (Inoue) in view of US Patent No 6,549,522 to Flynn.

3. With regards to claim 34, 35, 53, 54, 69, and 70, Inoue fails to teach the mobile router as recited in claim 20, wherein at least one of the processor and the memory are further adapted for:

sending a deregistration request to the Home Agent and receiving a deregistration reply from the Home Agent. However, Flynn teaches sending a deregistration request to the Home Agent and receiving a deregistration reply from the Home Agent, in order to let the Home agent

know when to stop packet forwarding to a mobile node in a foreign network to free up resources [column 2 lines 51-65].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of both Inoue and Flynn to send a deregistration request to the Home Agent in order to let the Home agent know when to stop packet forwarding to a mobile node in a foreign network to free up resources.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 21-23, 25-33, 40-42, 44-52, 56-58, and 60-68 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. 6,567,664 to Bergenwall et al. column 4 line 57 to column 5 line 17 is pertinent to independent claims 20, 39, 55, and 71.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E Martinez whose telephone number is (703) 305-4890. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A Gaffin can be reached on (703) 308-3301. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DEM



JEFFREY DAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100